DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 537 FL 001 322

By-Hadley, Paul E.

Foreign Language Teaching and the National Interest.

Southern California Modern and Classical Language Association.
Pub Date Dec 68
Note-4p.; Speech given before the Biennial Conference of the California Council of Foreign Language Teachers Associations (5th, Los Angeles, November 4, 1967)
Journal Cit-Forum; v7 n2 p6-9 December 1968
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.30
Descriptors-*Area Studies, *Educational Needs, Financial Support, Foreign Relations, Generalization, Interdisciplinary Approach, International Education, *Language Instruction, *National Programs, Program Design, *Program Proposals, Second Language Learning, Specialization, Team Teaching, Uncommonly Taught Languages, World Affairs

Emphasized in this address are the current needs for foreign language and area studies teaching in the United States. A discussion of program desiderata includes interdisciplinary approach practices, generalist versus specialist considerations, and team teaching potential. Also mentioned briefly are government, as opposed to private, funding of such programs as well as the necessity for instruction in critical language fields. (AF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED029537

FL 001 822

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING

Dr. Paul E. Hadley, Dean, Univers
University of Sout

I am especially honored to be here when I see the distinguished people who are sitting in front of me and when I read the roster of those who have addressed you in the section meetings. There is a kind of anomaly about a luncheon speaker. Even if the speaker is not a part of the menu, Mrs. Bradley — if he is worth inviting, he says something that upsets the digestion of the people at luncheon; and if he really does that, he produces a reaction that upsets his own digestion; and you sometimes wonder about luncheon speakers at all! But I do mean to try to be provocative; I don't wish to add to any physical discomfort that you may feel, but I guess that is really my function.

And so I shall try to say some things that will disturb you a bit. Not for the first part of the talk however, as I think we all rejoice in the fact that business has been looking up in the last few years for language instructors. When I was a language instructor some decades ago, it was not as easy a job as it is now; there wasn't a great deal of government money for us to tap. We were looked upon as the peripheral, non-essential members of the academic community. But, happily, those things have changed. There is more honor for us, I think, now, in our own country, even though sometimes we have to secure that honor by association with the area specialists.

World-Minded Attitude In A Changing World

The times have changed, I think, when it was possible for an American ambassador in a foreign country, to say: "If those people want to talk with me, let them learn English". That concept has disappeared. In trying to do something to update my thinking, I discovered an important work written in 1945 by a man who was, at that time, assistant professor at Columbia University, Dr. Mario Pei. I am sure you know his book, *Languages for War and Peace*. In the rather dreamy introduction to that book, Professor Pei wrote:

"When peace is restored to a war-weary world, the benefits of linguistic training will be . . . vast and . . . enduring. American soldiers scattered throughout the four corners of the globe . . . will need languages. Later, when the world economy is put on a far more stable footing, and commercial exchanges become far more intensive than ever before, men and women with linguistic training will be at premium. The demand for diplomatic and consular representatives, for government employees, for commercial travellers with a knowledge of foreign languages will exceed anything ever known. More foreigners will come to our shores, more Americans will travel abroad. Traveling for pleasure in the post-war world will no longer be restricted to a few tourists. The men who have been abroad, to a hundred different lands, on a military mission will wish to revisit those lands, to continue and tighten the bonds of friendship formed there . . . In the world of tomorrow, political, military and economic isolation will be things of the past. Linguistic isolation and self-sufficiency . . . will be regarded as something just as outmoded and ridiculous as political isolationism and economic autarchcy have proved to be . . . Our more remote need is to create a world-minded attitude that will lead to the proper kind of international relations, commercial, economic, diplomatic and cultural . . . making a recurrence of the present conflict unlikely, and will endow a considerable segment of our population with the sort of linguistic training that will enable them, to their own personal advancement and to the benefit of the nation and the world at large, to take advantage of the innumerable opportunities that peace will bring in its wake."

I said it was dreamy, and yet it was a remarkably good forecast of many things that have taken place and are continuing to occur in our time. Our own government has embodied and given substance to the prophecy by the creation, among other measures, of the National Defense Education Act. Its purpose, which is of course frankly designed in the national interest, is to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvements of educational programs to meet critical national needs. During its first years NDEA has provided support for institutes, language and area centers, fellowships in research, and studies to improve the level of modern foreign languages at all levels of education. In those first six years, more than 17,500 elementary and secondary schools language teachers have attended institutes. There have also been institutes for the teaching of English as a second language. There have been 55 NDEA language and area centers established in thirty-four universities. Ninety critical languages have been supported by NDEA, and the statistics could continue; indeed they have been intensified with each successive renewal of the Act. The foundations likewise have contributed to our support, not always the way we would have liked them to do, and not always by any means in recognition of the proposals that you and I may have composed, but, nevertheless, their generosity has been considerable.

A Reevaluation Of Accomplishments Is In Order

I am afraid, however, that there are some signs that these sources are drying up, not only because of political change in California and in other parts of the country, Washington included, but also because of a certain discomfiture on the part of many of the foundations. There is a feeling that things have not come off quite as well as they should — in particular, that area studies have not realized their potential. Then of course, there is also the psychology, particularly on the part of the foundations, that what they were doing was contributing 'seed money" and that schools, universities, local and state governments should pick up the burden; that after the conditions had been analyzed and the first grants made, that then we ought to be able to do our own work. This, then, becomes an important time for a reassessment of what we are doing. What is there that should be preserved, strengthened, defended, supported with local and personal initiative? What is it we are going to work with our principals, our school boards, and our boards of trustees, with our local governmental enterprises, and even with such pressure and lobby groups as we may have in Washington, to continue the support of the vital aspects of our programs? Just what is it we feel important enough to keep on doing and to improve?

Communication Through Language For The National Interest And National Security

Certainly one of the criteria to be considered is the one which represents the second part of my title this noon, the national interest. Back in those years when I was first a teacher, it was intellectual to deplore the old concept of "My country right or wrong." We felt that it expressed our freedom as intellectuals to say that our country might

*Address delivered at the Fifth Biennial Conference of the California Council of Foreign Language Teachers Associations at the International Hotel in Los Angeles on November 4, 1967.

AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

ity College and Summer Session
hern California *

frequently be wrong. Now, we have gone a step farther. It seems difficult among intellectuals now to find people who say that our country is ever right, and I deplore this. I think some of you probably do too. I read with some dismay the reports of national association meetings (in the social studies disciplines in particular, and perhaps also in your disciplines), where the scholars will vote unanimously and with standing ovations to support resolutions by which their members refuse to work for the United States government in any way, because it commits them to a political position which their consciences do not allow them to support. Some of these same people will even go as far as not to accept Federal money! The tragedy of the CIA is something that most of us consider with great concern. Whatever dishonesty there may have been in paying people to work for the CIA, people who didn't know they were working for the Government — and I don't like that kind of dishonesty either — it was a terrible tragedy, it seems to me, for the United States and for us as scholars to have its work as severely truncated as has occurred in the last year. It has certainly hurt the national interest of the United States at home and abroad, to have a vital part of our government apparatus in time of war, perhaps also in time of peace, interfered with in its essential work.

The national interest is a difficult concept, even if it be, in some minds, a reactionary concept. I thing, as Hans Morgenthau — whom else could I quote in this kind of situation? — wrote:

"The objectives of foreign policy must be defined in terms of the national interest and must be supported with adequate power . . . .. The national interest of a peace-loving nation can only be defined in terms of national security, and national security must be defined in integrity of the national territory and of its institutions. If the kind of interest determining political action in a particular period of history depends upon the political and cultural context within which foreign policy is formulated . . . The same observations apply to the concept of power. Its content and the manner of the use of power are determined by the political and cultural environments . . . While the realist [in international politics] indeed believes that interest [national interest] is the perennial standard by which political action must be judged and directed, the contemporary connection between interest and the national state is a product of history and must therefore be bound to disappear in the course of history. Nothing in the realist position militates against the assumption that the present division of the political world into nation states will be replaced by larger units of quite different character, in keeping with the technical circumstances and the moral requirements of the contemporary world."

Peace then will be obtained, not, I think, by traducing the national interest, but by diplomacy, by accommodation, by harmonization, as those who wrote the National Defense Education Act made quite clear when they stated that we need increased comprehension and facility in the use of the languages of the world, and an understanding, a usable understanding, of the cultures from which those languages arise. We teach foreign languages, then, in order that we may communicate, and yet I wonder sometimes how much we understand the process of communication — which of the various capabilities of public communication are politically relevant? This is one reason why detailed research and planning on the local level are necessary. "We cannot, for example, cultivate those favorable dispositions which exist in the Soviet Union if we lack knowledge of them and are unable to establish rapport with the people possessing them or, as an official of AID has stated, 'Until we know more about communicating with people in the emerging countries, we are working with half our brains tied behind our backs.' " (I am citing W. Phillip Davison's recent study, *International Political Communication.*)

Unfortunately, "A major part of the research conducted thus far has been to see that our messages are in fact getting through . . ." to be certain that we are handling out a line which will physically reach the targets that we are sending it to, and in grammatical and literary and published form, so that it can be read or listened to by the people we want to reach. We have done precious little in analysis of the quality of those messages or of the psychological and cultural factors which determine them. I believe that it is a proper function of the information and cultural program directors in government to see to it that effective communication does take place. I would like to share with you some recommendations of the Davison study — this is a Council on Foreign Relations study — published by Praeger in 1965. Dr. Davidson gives these recommendations for an effective kind of communication program. "First," he writes, "the United States should build more purposefully on its traditions of free public discussion and should regard freedom of information as the cornerstone of its international communication policy . . . We should remove the barriers to the free flow of ideas that we have erected, ourselves, and should use all available instrumentalities to break down other barriers and to increase freedom of communication throughout the world. We should place more emphasis on a two-way exchange between the United States and other nations and encourage other people to speak to us." "Secondly, it is a proper function," Dr. Davison continues, "for the United States to advance the foreign policies which we hold and which we seek to promulgate, just as it is for us to try to understand the foreign policies promulgated by other countries." And, thirdly, we should make "increased efforts" "to bring government and private American communications to other peoples into a more harmonious relationship."

Of course, we have to recognize that government and private communications may not be parallel, and that, in a free society, there may be frequent occasions when the goals of the country and the goals of private scholars may have a dissonant ring when they are sought at the same time. Even so, greater harmony can be achieved by stimulating an awareness on the part of those who are in touch with foreign audiences as to the political side of that which they say and do.

Foreign Language Teaching
And Area Studies Teaching
—An Interdisciplinary Approach

Foreign language teaching is a vehicle, not a destination; a means, not an end. In this jet age when it is possible for a diplomat or a professor, or even a dean, to get half way around the world before his brain catches up, we had better realize that communication is a two-way business and that the national interest not only does not prohibit, but even requires, improved communication through language. At this time, I think, there is only one major political philosophy in the world which does not believe in pluralism. The Communists are convinced that there is but one form of

(Continued on Page 8)

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST*

(Continued from Page 7)

government, one form of social organization which is suitable. At least theoretically, we in the United States believe in pluralism. This is increasingly a pluralistic world, and more and more of us are coming to recognize it. Whatever happened to the one-language concept, the idea that English was going to be the **lingua franca** for everyone? The mechanics of world trade, world communication, can certainly increase the number of people who will speak English to each other, but it seems to me that even we in the English-speaking world have stopped proclaiming the singular virtues of our language. Part of this is because of the beating we have taken in various parts of the world. The last half century has done a good deal to shatter the Western belief in our particular form of progress, and in the perfectibility of man according to our pattern. "Similarly, events have overthrown belief in the universal applicability of Western science and institutions, and the unilinear concept of societal growth." (I have been quoting George Taylor of the University of Washington.)

We do, I think, have to recognize that there are many cultures, many area concepts to be understood. I fear, however, that we fall into what might be called a double dichotomy here: not only the dichotomy which we find in our classrooms between the teaching of language and the teaching of literature, but an even more severe break, a more severe difficulty, between those who teach language and literature and those who teach social studies.

Your president mentioned the fact that, for a number of years, I helped with the Woodrow Wilson Fellowship selection processes. (Here is one of the places I am going to hurt your digestion.) The narrowest graduates that we have met in the Woodrow Wilson competition have consistently been the foreign language graduates. Of course, none of them has got as far in teaching as you people here! I suspect those were the people who didn't go into teaching at all, but nevertheless, year after year, it was depressing to find the foreign languages graduate who had memorized a great deal, who had achieved a tremendous amount of technical proficiency, who had taken survey and history courses in the literature of his language, but who was not very responsive to a philosophical or psychological or historical or an analytical question as to the political background of the literature or the culture represented by the language he hoped to teach.

I don't know how we resolve this; yet I am sure it has bothered all of you. It was bothering the people in the Spanish section this morning when I sat in. We recognize the need for breadth, but we are concerned with the need to get that conjugation taught, or that particular technical proficiency taken care of. There is, however, as I have suggested before, a growing realization in government and in society as a whole, that the maker of policy must be concerned with all aspects of the lives of the foreign peoples. "Not only must he," and here I am quoting George Taylor again, not only must the policy maker "be concerned with the processes of diplomacy and government, the basic physical and geographic endowments, the economic behavior, and the demographic patterns of some two hundred major foreign cultures, but the policy maker must also be concerned with their social patterns and institutions, the web of religions, taboos, and myths and the thought processes and self-images which enter into the national style. Thus government must know what the anthropologist, linguist, and social psychologist have to say, as well as the political scientist, economist, and historian." The Social Science Research Council has laid down criteria for area programs in college and university curricula: 1) There must be official university acceptance and support. (An area program somehow bootlegged by a foreign language department is not going to progress far.) 2) There need to be adequate library resources for both teaching and research. 3) There should be competent instruction in the principal languages (plural) of the area. (If you teach Spanish but not Portuguese, you are failing; if you teach Spanish and Portuguese but not Quechua or Guarani, you may be failing. 4) To build an area studies program you need to provide offerings in at least five different subjects in addition to language, says the Social Science Research Council, and 5) Your institution must have specific mechanisms for integrating the area studies. (I wonder if any of you have had the sad experience that I have had in applying for area studies support and being told: "Yes, you have this in history and that in political science and that in international relations and that in foreign language, but who is putting them together? What kind of integration have you achieved?" 6) You need an area research program. 7) Finally, the Social Science Research Council has insisted that there be emphasis on the contemporary aspects of the area.

And yet again, a final warning, this does not mean to substitute an area study for a discipline. It means an interdisciplinary approach, it means the harmonization of the work of the several disciplines in libraries and laboratories. And it means as happily, I have heard several times today, an insistence upon the necessity of field research.

How To Resolve The Dilemma Of The Generalist Versus The Specialist?

Undoubtedly, you are ahead of me here. You perceive that there is a danger of another dichotomy, a dilemma between the specialist and the generalist. There is the problem of breaking the barriers between the disciplines; one needs to encourage the linguists, the historians, the geographers, the lawyers, the economists, the anthropologists. All of those who are studying about a region need to talk to each other and to understand one another's problems. (That statement was paraphrased from the Hayter Report to the British Grants Commission, not from an American source.)

Language teaching is by itself a problem, which we have to worry about. How does the language teacher resolve this dilemma between the training of the specialist and the training of the area expert? I am sure some of you are thinking about the 90% of the students in your classes who are not interested in the disciplines in which you work. They are going on to medical school or agriculture or business or what have you, and the kind of academic rigor that I am talking about is really of no meaning to them. How do we distinguish between what we teach them and what we teach the people who are going to represent you more directly in the teaching field? This morning I attended a very impressive and well organized meeting of the Spanish section and heard, in addition to a distinguished paper by Dr. Lewis Hanke, the results of a survey conducted among their members. I trust that they will forgive me if I express some respectful skepticism about including "10% to 20% cultural materials in their courses," whether or not these materials are "thoroughly integrated." I did like very much the honesty of the high school teacher who said that his cultural contribution is to teach thirty-eight songs and four dances, the latter with the prettiest girl in the class! I agree with his position that he probably accomplishes more than if he forces them to learn some erudite material which will be forgotten by the time the course is over. I was also impressed by the honesty of the university Spanish department chairman who said that his faculty is not offering a Latin-American civilization course this year, because Lewis Hanke, a great historian, is on their faculty and he can do it better.

I repeat that there must be a careful distinction between rigorous discipline and a cultural introduction; in the latter, perhaps a few cultural ideas, plus how to say — again I am quoting — "Hello and Goodbye," are all we can hope for. But is this the best kind of teaching we can do in the national interest, Keep the children happy?

Team-Teaching For The Integration Of The Various Disciplines

If the academic situation allows, and solid introductions both to language and culture and to the social studies are possible, I think we must think much more carefully of team teaching, and many institutions are now doing so. Team teaching, I think, can be useful on any level, perhaps even in the high schools. I have seen some distinguished work in high schools, including Pasadena High School for one. I think that team teaching is also possible on the junior college as well as on the college and university levels. Innovations are one way to get grants, even in these declining days of grantsmanship. But I think that we all have to swallow a certain amount of pride. Why should I as a language instructor attempt to explain a difficult concept in anthropology while there is down the hall a distinguished anthropologist? Why should not the language teacher work out his presentations with the history teachers? Why should your principal or your curriculum coordinator in a school district not make it possible for that kind of association to take place?

I would even suggest that some high schools might make a real innovation and forget about some of the traditional courses they have been giving and actually set up coordinated area studies. I don't think the loss would be as much as some people might think in giving a strong area studies program on any area of the world. The realists in educational circles are telling us today that we forget much of the subject matter anyway. Let's give people a solid experience which will stay rather than a smattering of many subjects. Let's do as well as possible whatever it is that we decide to do.

Lack Of Teaching Of Critical Languages Endangers National Interest

And then, the foreign language departments have a problem with reference to what languages to teach. We are told by government that the critical languages are the ones that almost are never taught in high schools or junior colleges, and seldom even offered in four-year colleges: Arabic, Hindu, Urdu, Portuguese. Russian, Chinese and Japanese are a little better off, but are still so insufficiently taught in the sense of scope or quantity, that we remain in peril nationally because of the lack of people who can handle those languages, and, of course, there are hundreds of other languages where we need help.

I have been talking with Mrs. Gonzalves here at lunch, and she does not seem as shocked as I thought she would be with a suggestion that a high school district might put in a program in an unusual critical language — of course, particularly if the ethnic background in the community is such that social and intellectual purposes might also be served by the creation, let's say, of a program in a high school of Portuguese or Korean. I would recommend very strongly to your attention the report of the Brademas Committee — this is a collection of readings prepared under the direction of Congressman Brademas in the hearings for the International Education Act. It may be that we are all going to be frustrated if Congress never puts any money into implementation of the Act, but the thinking in its drafting and the intellectual ferment that has been created in the United States by the activities of the proponents of the Act under Dr. Paul Miller and others are immensely worth our while and should, I think, stimulate all of us.

The danger remains, as I have said, however, in the dissipation of our attention. We can be respected in scholarly circles only if we ourselves are scholarly. How do you decide when you can afford to be superficial and when you must be rigorous?

The night before his death, Franklin Roosevelt wrote: "Today, science has brought all the different quarters of the globe so close together that it is impossible to isolate them from one another. Today, we are faced with the preeminent fact that if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships, the ability of all peoples of all kinds to live together and work together in the same world at peace."

Since the end of the Roosevelt era, nearly all of our policy makers have come to recognize the urgency of language training for United States representatives abroad — the broad categories that Professor Pei described in that same year of 1945. If the language instructor is to serve the idealistic goal of creating sympathy and understanding with other peoples, whether his goal is pure scholarship, or whether, as I have tried to show this afternoon, he has a vital role also in developing a trained citizenry in behalf of the national interest, there is an important division of function. We need both the specialist and the generalist, we need both the ivory tower and realistic team teaching.

I believe we can do a better piece of work without sacrificing any of the higher values which we all recognize to be inherent, if indeed sometimes latent, in the material of our disciplines.

FORUM of the MODERN AND CLASSICAL LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, INC.
Vol. VII, No. 2 — December, 1968
PUBLISHING COMMITTEE: E. Jules Mandel, Rosa E. Delanoeye and Sylvain Bernstein.
The FORUM is sent to members of MCLASC. Membership is $6.50 per year, payable to The Very Rev. Donald Montrose, 1520 West Ninth St., Los Angeles, Calif. 90015.
Permission from reprinting articles must be requested from the author on all signed articles. Others may be reprinted by crediting the FORUM, stating Volume Number and Issue.